



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## LUTHER'S TRANSLATION OF THE PSALMS IN 1523-24.

The first edition of Luther's translation of the New Testament appeared in Wittenberg, in September, 1522. It was received with great enthusiasm, and although the price, one and one-half gulden, was high, it was not long before the edition was exhausted. The translation had been completed during the author's seclusion at the Wartburg, and needed but the critical hand of Melanchthon, and the ready advice of Spalatin to prepare it for the press. Its enthusiastic reception acted as an incentive to Luther, and led him to proceed to the translation of the Old Testament. For this task, while at the Wartburg, he had felt the need of advice from distant friends and of books not available in his Patmos. In Wittenberg all these were at hand, and so in the midst of strife and controversy, with the edict of Worms endangering his very existence, in the midst of preaching and teaching, Luther set his hand to the completion of his great undertaking: the translation of the whole Bible. The translation of the Old Testament appeared piece-meal, for the convenience of both the translator and the purchaser. The first part, containing the Pentateuch, appeared about the middle of the year 1523; the second part, containing the historical books, appeared without date, probably in the next year. The third part, as planned, was to contain the remaining Old Testament books with the exception of the Apochrypha. The stress of other duties, however, left the difficult Prophets to be added later, so that the third part, upon its appearance in September or October of 1524, contained Job, the Psalms, and the writings of Solomon (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon). This, then, was the first appearance of the entire Psalter as translated by Luther.<sup>1</sup>

This translation of the whole Psalter marks a most significant stage in the activity of Luther. The work of 1523-24, to be sure, is far removed from the Psalter as it appeared in the complete Bible of 1545, because every subsequent edition after 1524 contained a number of changes and corrections. In the development

<sup>1</sup> Until recently it was thought that a separate edition of the Psalter had appeared before the first edition of the third part. Pietsch in his introduction to the manuscript shows that this Psalter was printed from the third part edition and not from the manuscript.

of the German Psalter as we have it today these later editions have their peculiar value and significance. In the work of Luther, however, the interest must center in the first complete edition. We need only remember that it remained the basis for future editions to show the logic of this procedure. What is more, the work of 1523-24 is much more Luther's own than the subsequent corrected editions on which he had the active assistance of a goodly circle of linguists and scholars. What he did in 1523-24 and how he did it remain after all the questions of most vital importance in the determining of the value of Luther's contribution.

It has been the rare good fortune of Luther students, that a large part of the original manuscript of the Bible translation has been preserved. Manuscripts in the archives at Zerbst, in Anhalt, and in the Royal Library at Berlin contain the greater part of the translation, written in the hand of Luther. The latter manuscript is of particular interest to us in this study of his Psalm translation. It contains, in addition to the original of the translation of Deuteronomy, the original in Luther's own hand of practically all of the third part of the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup> It has remained for the careful, scholarly work of Paul Pietsch in the Weimar edition of Luther's works to make this manuscript available to the most distant student. The first volume of the section devoted to the German Bible brings a faithful transcription of this manuscript with all its corrections and annotations.<sup>3</sup>

The manuscript is evidently the one which went to the press. The marks of the printer are everywhere in evidence, and it is a convincing bit of testimony to the stress of Luther's activity that a manuscript so full of annotations and corrections and not a clean copy, should have been placed in the hands of the printer. Of especial interest and of exceptional importance is the fact that absolutely everything in the manuscript with the exception of page numbering and the marks of the type-setter, is in the hand-writing of Luther himself. The original draft, as well as all marginal and foot-notes, headings, annotations, and corrections, is clearly the work of the great translator.

The corrections in the part of the manuscript containing the Psalms, as in all parts of the manuscript of the Bible translation,

<sup>2</sup> There are two gaps in the Psalms: 48.2-80.9 and 95.4-109.2.

<sup>3</sup> *Luther's Werke. Deutsche Bibel I.* Weimar 1906, pp. 453-563.

are extremely numerous. These numerous corrections may, however, be grouped into two general classes. In the first class are immediate corrections made as the first draft was being written down. In the other class are corrections made when a general revision was undertaken. The corrections of the latter class are in red ink, and are naturally more numerous and more important than those made immediately at the time of the first draft. That we have to do here with a first draft as well as a printer's copy is evident upon closer examination. The number of immediate corrections proves this, and the nature of some of them proves it even more conclusively. Many are nothing more than corrections of slips in spelling, case, capitalization, word-order, or verse arrangement. The fact that an adjective is often added above the line, at a point preceding the noun it modifies, points to a first draft, for such an omission would be easily made and yet immediately caught, since the adjective followed the noun in both the Latin and Hebrew originals.<sup>4</sup> The corrections in black ink, then, were not made at the time of a general revision, but at the time of the first draft. A general revision would have been far more comprehensive, and would have touched many passages which afterwards were revised.

When we discard, and discard correctly, the idea of a revision before the final red ink revision, we come upon peculiar and highly significant characteristics of the first draft. It contained (1) many blanks to be filled later with words or phrases; (2) many Hebrew and Latin words, phrases, and sentences in the text; (3) many verses left unfinished; (4) innumerable words and passages left with two or more parallel translations. All these peculiarities point to the fact that a revision was planned and then immediately undertaken. Whether undertaken at various stages of the translation, or at the end, we are unable to say from the manuscript. That it was a labor extending over many different days is evident, not only from the painstaking care exhibited, but also from the fact that more care was expended on some parts than on others. The call of other duties often took the writer from his work.

The red ink revision, of course, brought new renditions and translations, in some cases to render more nearly the language of the original, in others to improve upon the German. But the peculiar character of the first draft made other demands on the

<sup>4</sup> Such insertions are found 5.8, 119.114, and 119.148.

revision. It had to fill blanks, cut Hebrew or Latin words and phrases, very often supply German equivalents, complete unfinished portions, and in the numerous cases of parallel translation, retain either one or the other, or supply a new word or phrase.

The nature of the corrections seems to prove that there was but one general revision. There are a few instances where the red ink translation is again changed, but these cases are so few in number that they may reasonably be looked upon as immediate corrections made at the time of the general revision. The resulting changes are consequently numerous, and vary in nature and scope. Nevertheless it is a significant fact which casts a strong light not only on the translating ability and language sense of the scribe, but also on his knowledge of the material in hand that forty-five per cent of the text needed no correction in the final revision and went to press in the form of the first draft. About twenty per cent of all the verses have no corrections whatsoever.

This manuscript of the Psalm translation has more than a mere antiquarian interest for the student of Luther. Indeed, it has an interest which is shared by no other part of the Bible translation. The reason for this lies in the fact that no other book of either Testament had been made, by Luther, the subject of so much labor as the Psalms. Naturally, there is no other book in which he felt so much at home, or of which his judgment was so sure. As a result, we are free to look upon the Psalm translation as the culmination and final member of a long series of labors. An examination of the manuscript is then of immense profit and advantage, since the previous history of the translation lies before us, and we need seldom puzzle over the reasons for a certain translation or rendition.

With the manuscript of the Psalm translation, we are given the key which unlocks the work-shop of the reformer. A careful comparison of the manuscript with his earlier exegetical labors explains to us the nature of the final rendition. A study of the corrections and annotations in the light of the material with which he worked, gives us many a clue to guide us in a determination of his sources and his attitude towards them. We are enabled to trace the development of the work as it grew, word by word, under the pen of the author, and arrive thereby at a clear estimate of his method of procedure. Finally with the genesis of the work clear to us, the sources determined, the method evolved, we can better appreciate the merit and value of the work as a literary monument, and dis-

cern more easily in how far it bears the personal stamp of the genius which called it into being.

As a source, this manuscript takes precedence over every other. Without the manuscript our study would be limited to a comparison of the printed edition of 1524 with the bits of translation appearing before that time, and with the subsequent editions. In a determination of Luther's basis of translation and method of procedure, this would be but little fruitful. We could arrive at conclusions only by inference because the nature of the printed edition of 1524 would remain an unknown factor. With the manuscript, however, the peculiar nature of the edition of 1524 is explicable. The manuscript gives us a wealth of material of primary value in the solution of those problems which must needs be left without solution if only the testimony of later editions be taken into account. The printed edition of 1523-24 is the fundamental basis, and until the nature of that basis is explained, the nature and cause and explanation of later changes must remain in doubt. The material for such an explanation is given in the manuscript as set down by Luther himself.

An understanding of the Psalm translation, and consequently of the manuscript of that translation, is attainable only when one has clearly in mind the position which the Psalms occupied in Luther's everyday life and thought, and when one sees in survey the scope and character of his work on the Psalms prior to the translation of 1523-4.

The translation of the Bible was an undertaking which his own teachings and labors had rendered imperative. He had set up the Scriptures as the source of all truth, and had refused to submit to any judgment not based on the Bible. His work he freely submitted to the test of Scriptural argument, and held his writings higher than other works not grounded in this manner. He urged his contemporaries to a constant reading and study of the Scriptures, and translated the Bible in order to give them the means and material for such study and reading. In his own life, reading and study of the Bible were not a mere diversion or literary exercise. They were an absolute necessity. The result was a keen and thorough knowledge of the Bible. He had not begun to study the Bible until he was twenty years old, but he made up in eagerness and zeal for this late beginning. When the life of the cloister gave him the opportunity for study, it was to the Bible that he turned his atten-

tion, and he read so diligently that in a short time he knew the book thoroughly. He afterwards says that he could quote the pages on which the various verses were to be found.<sup>5</sup> With this in mind, we can appreciate the significance of his remark that in no part of the Bible was he so exercised as in the Psalms.<sup>6</sup> This is to be explained by the high opinion in which he held them. For Luther the measure by which the value of a book of the Bible was to be ascertained was the directness of its reference to Christ and His teachings. With this in mind he called the Psalms a Bible in miniature, and says that the Psalter and the Pauline epistles are the noblest and at the same time the most difficult parts of the Bible. It was then but natural that in his earlier studies he should be led to emphasize the prophetic nature of the Psalms, and refer everything in them to the coming of the Messiah. Later, as he came to study them more closely, he became more and more impressed with the fact that they lent themselves to practical everyday application. They came to have a value in themselves apart from their prophetic qualities.

He pointed out an essential difference between the Psalms and the other books of the Old Testament. The vast body of the Old Testament meant for him a definition of the Law of God as revealed to man. In the Psalms, however, he saw, not the stern, law-giving, judging God, but the indulgent Father, who generously took into consideration the weaknesses and deficiencies of His children. So Luther came to see in the Psalms the portrayal of the soul of man seeking salvation. God, the Father, had foreseen the trials and tribulations of the erring man, and had given him this book of prayers and songs for use in moments of darkness and despair.

From our modern standpoint, this led to the one fundamental weakness in all Luther's exegetical commentary on the Psalms. Nowhere is any attempt made at historical criticism. For Luther the Psalms contained things eternal, whose meaning was entirely independent of time and place and circumstance of composition. The author was not David, but the spirit of God speaking through David. The "of David" in the titles of many of the poems, he construes more as a dative and says ". . . . spiritus sancti qui fecit psalmum et revelabit Davidi seu ad David."<sup>7</sup> The

<sup>5</sup> Koestlin—*Martin Luther, sein Leben und seine Schriften*. Fünfte Auflage Berlin, 1903. I. 56.

<sup>6</sup> Werke, Weimar. V. 22-23.

<sup>7</sup> Werke, Weimar. III-41.

Psalms were for him part of the active working-machinery of the salvation-seeking Christian and his church. They were to be placed with the Lord's Prayer, the Decalogue, and the Apostles' Creed, and to be used daily in private prayer and public worship. He protested that in the Roman church not even a single "Psaelman" was to be heard, and when he came to work out his form of church service the Psalms received special prominence in the form of responsive readings and songs.

For the common man, in his private life, the Psalms were to be a source of comfort and inspiration. Everywhere we find him directing to the Psalms the attention of his friends in their hours of distress as well as in moments when fortune smiled. In his own life, the Psalter was his constant companion. On the way to Wittenberg the Swiss students found him in the inn at Jena, poring over a Hebrew Psalter; at the Wartburg he said his companion was the Psalter; at Koburg it was always at hand; and even while hunting, he carried it in his pocket. In his deepest moments we find him turning to the Psalter for comfort and consolation. In times of serious illness as in 1527 at Wittenberg, and in 1537 at Schmalkalden, he read Psalms or parts of Psalms. On hearing of the death of his father, he took his Psalter and retired to his chamber to pray. When the news of the death of his implacable enemy, Duke George of Saxony, was brought to him, he read the fifty-eighth Psalm. When his own hour had come and death was at hand, he repeated several times the twenty-first verse of the sixty-eighth Psalm. This constant reading and reciting of the Psalms led to a thorough knowledge of the book. During the illness of 1527 he often recited the whole sixth Psalm, and there can be no doubt that he knew by heart a large amount of the Psalter. It was his custom to recite sections of Psalms together with his morning and evening prayers,—a practice which he urged parents to encourage in their children.

With this high opinion of the Psalter and its practical value, it must have been exceedingly painful for Luther to see how the Psalms had disappeared from the public worship as well as from the every-day religious life of the common man. If the Psalter was to serve the high purposes and fill the dignified place which Luther desired, it must first be rescued from the oblivion into which it had undeservedly fallen. This was what Luther set out to accomplish, and the result was a number of critical and exegetical labors on the Psalms, designed to give a sound and serviceable explanation of

them. But these labors were not an end in themselves. The Psalter, once drawn out from "under the bench," must be made available for the common man. The early labors led inevitably to the translation of the whole Psalter, by which the Psalms would be made an integral part of the every-day religious observance of the people.

Luther's earliest labors on the Psalms were undertaken in connection with his activity as a teacher in the University of Wittenberg. In the year 1512 the degree of Doctor of Theology was conferred on Luther. The teachers of theology of the time did but little with the Bible, centering their attention on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard. Fortunately, Wittenberg had a chair entitled "lectura in biblia," and this was given to Luther. Henceforward he lectured only on Biblical books of both Testaments, and called himself not Doctor of Theology but "Doktor der heiligen Schrift." It is of significance that his first course of lectures dealt with the Psalms, and no better proof can be found of the fact that the Psalms for him contained the kernel of faith. From them and from the Epistle to the Romans his own faith had been drawn, and these two books were the subject-matter of his earliest lectures.

These early lectures have come down to us as the first written work of Luther on the Psalms.<sup>8</sup> Again we are fortunate in possessing two manuscript remains of this course of lectures. The one is in the library at Wolfenbüttel, the other in Dresden. The former is a Latin Psalter printed especially for Luther, with wide margins and double spacing, and contains numerous interlinear and marginal notes. The latter contains a series of longer commentaries on a large number of the Psalms. These "Scholae" were probably the lectures themselves, based on the "Glossae" or notes in the Psalter.

Of vast moment for his later translation is this work of 1513-1516. The work on a Psalm began with a careful study of the words themselves. Although Luther was as yet lacking in the knowledge of the Hebrew, we find him here turning back at times to the Hebrew original. More often he does not go back directly to the Hebrew but to Latin works based on the Hebrew. He is aided much by the works of Reuchlin, particularly the "Septene psalmos poenitentiales hebraeos" (1512), and the "Rudimenta hebraica" (1506).

<sup>8</sup> *Dictata super Psalterium. Werke, Weimar III. IV.*

But his great aid on the linguistic side is the third Psalter version of Jerome, the “Psalterium juxta Hebraeos.” This was the only part of Jerome’s last Bible translation which had not been taken up as the Vulgate. It was made from the Hebrew texts of Jerome’s time, and was accepted by Luther as the best rendition of the Hebrew. When he refers to the Hebrew it is generally to Jerome’s last version, to which the reference points, and these references to Jerome are countless in number. In fact it may be said that he noted almost every instance where the work of Jerome differed from the Gallican Psalter of the Vulgate. In almost every case the testimony of Jerome is accepted over that of the Vulgate. We have here the first evidence of Luther’s intimacy with and dependence on the work of Jerome,—facts which have not been sufficiently emphasized in the study of the Bible translation.

In his exegetical labor he shows here a wide knowledge of authorities, and uses with a discriminating judgment the whole critical machinery of his age. He said later that in the Epistle to the Hebrews he had used Chrysostom, that Jerome had been his aid in the Epistles to Titus and Galatians, but that in working with the Psalter, he had used all the writers. True to his hostility towards the philosophy of Scholasticism, he rejects flatly the opinions and commentary of the schoolmen and their master Aristotle. Everywhere he goes back to the church fathers, Augustine, Cassiodorus, Jerome, Lyra, Burgensis, and a host of minor writers. Not only churchmen are brought in. Destined as these lectures were for the university students, they were enriched with numerous references to the classic authors, to Pliny, Horace, Ovid, Vergil, and even Plato. Everywhere we have evidence of a wide reading and an earnest seeking after the truth of the work in hand.

The Psalter is for him the book referring directly to Christ and His teachings. Everything is to be and can be brought into close relation to the life of Christ. This tropological standpoint is carried out to its limits, and hence prevents the author from assuming any true attitude of historical criticism. It leads him away from a literal interpretation of the words of the Psalter, and lays the way open to numerous allegorical interpretations, many of which are almost ludicrous. His great master in this was Lefèvre D’Étaples, whose “Quintuplex Psalterium” (Paris 1509. Second Edition 1513) with its numerous notes not only confirmed Luther in his critical method, but also furnished him with the text of Je-

rome's last Psalter version from the original Hebrew. Everywhere, however, in critical comment as well as in linguistic discipline, we find Luther adopting that method of procedure which afterwards became the principle of his activity as a translator. The versions and the opinions of the authorities were carefully compared. With a respect for authority which savors of monastic days, Luther first sought to justify each from the text in hand. Only seldom was a version or opinion entirely discarded. Each had its bit of truth for Luther, and he strove to find that bit. After such comparison, however, the belief that he also was a seeker after truth, permitted him to sit in judgment. This or that opinion was accepted; sometimes an entirely new one came to his mind; or more often, the various bits of truth were gathered and combined. This last method led to interesting results when he came to work out his Psalm translation.

The first Psalm commentary of Luther was not published during his lifetime, although he promised to prepare it for the press. His failure to do this together with the urgent requests from his friends and listeners, led him to his second series of lectures and expositions on the Psalms, which appeared piece-meal from 1519 to 1521.<sup>9</sup> The work takes up only the first twenty-two psalms, the last of which was finished at the Wartburg. On his return to Wittenberg the number of other duties prevented the completion of the work. The commentaries are so voluminous and wordy that Luther himself calls the work "geschwetzig." On the fifth psalm, for instance, the commentary consists of about thirty thousand words. The general method and attitude are similar to those of the earlier work, but the tone is different. The tone of the earlier work was more truly academic, that of the later more nearly polemic. The vast disturbances following the publication of the theses in 1517, had brought new aims and purposes into Luther's activity, and his critical labors after that time were bent to serve these ends. The great doctrine of justification by faith and the great combat with the Papacy are, in Luther's own words, the two "loci," which are agitated in his second Psalter commentary. Linguistically, the work is an advance, because of Luther's better knowledge of Hebrew, although he still complains that Hebrew grammar "does not entirely enter into the work." The work again shows the great influence of Jerome, whose final Psalter rendition is quoted time

<sup>9</sup> *Operationes in Psalmos. Werke, Weimar V.*

and again. Critically, we find a slight regression from the absolute tropological attitude of the earlier work. The Psalms are coming to have a value apart from their prophetic nature.

In addition to these works of an academic nature, which were in the language of the educated classes of the day, there were many others, popular in nature and in the language of the people. Luther, early in his career, turned his attention to giving the lower classes the Psalms in the vernacular. A survey of these early translations of parts of the Psalter forms an introductory chapter to the "Third Part" as translated in 1523-4. The Psalms which appeared prior to 1524 are the following:

- 1517 Psalms 6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143.
- 1518 Psalm 110.
- 1521 Psalms 68, 119, 37, 10, 142.
- 1522 Psalms 12, 67, 51, 103, 20, 79, 25, 10.<sup>10</sup>

The earliest work which Luther himself gave to the press bears the date 1517, and is a translation with commentary of the seven Penitential Psalms.<sup>11</sup> In this, his earliest work of Psalm translation, it is of interest to note that he worked not only with the Vulgate text, but also with the text of Jerome's "Psalterium *juxta Hebraeos*" and of Reuchlin's above mentioned "Septene." In his introduction he acknowledges this dependence, and says that he drew on these authorities for the sake of clearing up many difficult and vague passages in the Vulgate. The basis, then, remains the Vulgate, with Jerome and Reuchlin used as checks.

With the appearance of the "Auslegung des 109. (110.) Psalms"<sup>12</sup> in 1518, we come upon a favorite and characteristic practice of Luther in his commentary and translation. The work is dedicated to Hieronymus Ebner of Nuremberg, at the request of Luther's friend Scheurl. This remained a favorite habit of Luther's throughout his activity. Numerous Psalms were translated, explained, and annotated for the comfort of friends and congregations in distress. Other Psalms were worked over to aid in emphasizing some point in the controversial difficulties in which he was fast becoming

<sup>10</sup> Koestlin (I. 573) in his list of these Psalms omits Psalms 10 and 142 of the year 1521. He also still accepts the view that a special edition of the Psalter appeared before the first edition of the Third Part of the Old Testament in 1524.

<sup>11</sup> Werke, Weimar I. 154-220.

<sup>12</sup> Werke, Weimar I. 687-710.

involved. As a result we find such commentary very often appended to works of a polemical nature, or at the end of a discussion touching on the subject-matter of the particular Psalm. In regard to the translation of Psalm 110, we find the general method of the Busspsalmen carried farther. He prefixed his comment on the Psalm with parallel Latin and German texts. This Latin text agrees exactly with Luther's Vulgate, with the exception of the difficult third verse. Here Luther, because of decided difficulty with the Vulgate, casts loose from the common rendition, and by a comparison of Jerome, Lyra, and probably the Hebrew, reconstructs his text so as to make sense. His collation was still undertaken almost wholly in the interests of clearness.

The next Psalm translations were made during the stay at the Wartburg. Psalms 68<sup>13</sup> and 37<sup>14</sup> were edited for his poor leaderless congregation at Wittenberg. The long Psalm 119 came as an appendage to his work "Von der Beicht; ob die der Papst Macht habe zu gepieten."<sup>15</sup> In this work he drew largely from this Psalm, and decided to add the entire Psalm in translation. Psalm 142 was translated as a part of the work entitled "Troestung fuer eine Person in hohen Anfechtungen,"<sup>16</sup> the whole more in sermon form than usual in his commentary. Finally, from the Wartburg dates Psalm 10 which appeared as a part of the work bearing the title "Die Bulla vom Abendfressen des Papstes."<sup>17</sup> The Psalm was added in translation because in Luther's mind it depicted the Pope as the enemy of the church of Christ. The tone of the translation is very naturally rather more than a bit polemical, and when we find in the first draft of the translation of 1524 such expressions as "auffgeblasen", "maul", "tzufellet", "tzukrummet", "wueten," we can attribute their appearance to this earlier employment of the Psalm.

In all these Wartburg labors, we find the sources still varying. In Psalms 68, 37, and 119, we have a rendition drawing nearer to the Hebrew and yet showing a strong Vulgate influence. We know that Luther was busy with the Hebrew bible while at the Wartburg, and its use is apparent in his Psalm translation. The

<sup>13</sup> Werke, Weimar VIII. 1-35.

<sup>14</sup> Werke, Weimar VIII. 205-240.

<sup>15</sup> Werke, Weimar VIII. 129-204.

<sup>16</sup> Werke, Weimar VII. 779-791.

<sup>17</sup> Werke, Weimar VIII. 688-720.

translation of the long Psalm 119 is especially interesting. When we read it in the light of the earlier "Dictata super Psalterium," we can distinguish passages which show the influence of the Hebrew and of Jerome's last Psalter. The method was undoubtedly similar to that of the "Sieben Busspsalmen," of 1517 except that the Hebrew had come more into its own. An interesting peculiarity is to be noted. Whereas the use of the Hebrew is unmistakable in the translation itself, the quotations from other Psalms in the commentary are almost directly from the Vulgate. This same dependence on the Vulgate is shown best in Psalm 142, which is very nearly a literal rendition of the Vulgate.

The remaining Psalms which appeared before the edition of 1524 composed parts of the "Bettbuechlein" of 1522. By their introduction here, Luther wanted to bring home to his people the principle that the Psalms should form in their lives, as they did in his, a very integral part of all religious experience and observance.

There remains to mention only the great use made of Psalms in quotation. All Luther's works of religious or polemical nature in both German or Latin are full of Biblical quotations. Of these numerous quotations, the quotations from the Psalms outnumber those from any other book of the Bible. In his quoting, several peculiarities are apparent. One is that many quotations appear as deliberate paraphrases in which nothing more than the general tone of the Biblical rendering is retained. Another is that many quotations appear in free adaptation, leading us to believe that Luther quoted very largely from memory. An added support for this contention is offered in the numerous slips which occur when Luther attempts to cite the passage exactly. This variance of quotation did not seem to worry the author in the least. In his work "Grund und Ursach aller Artikel,"<sup>18</sup> Psa'm 19.13 appears four times in various forms. This same verse appears five times in other works of Luther of the same period in as many different forms. A third peculiarity is the deliberate combination and adaptation of Bible quotations to fit the passage or occasion. Luther's words as he laid the bull of excommunication on the flames are a good example of this: "Because thou hast troubled the anointed of the Lord, the everlasting fire shall destroy thee,"—a combination of Joshua 7. 25 with Mark 1. 24 and Acts 2. 27, made to fit the occasion. This manner of quoting throws a bright light on Luther's attitude

<sup>18</sup> Werke, Weimar VII. 299-458.

toward the Scriptural text. In it he saw the everlasting truth, and to it he turned for support and guidance in his work. But he was not actuated by a reverence and worship of the abstract word. With the words themselves he felt perfectly free to operate as he chose, or as the exigencies of the situation demanded, as long as the sense, as he conceived it, remained intact. This attitude, in itself, is of vast importance when we find Luther at work as a translator. Filled with a feeling that he is dealing with the truth and that he has discovered that truth for himself, he is not hampered by an awe or a reverence for the words in their literal significance.

As a result of these continued labors Luther began the Psalm translation in a spirit somewhat different from that in which he went at the other parts of the Bible. He knew the Psalms thoroughly; they had become part of his daily life. His knowledge of the languages gave him the means of entering into a linguistic study of the various texts and versions. Much of the Psalter had been translated by him before, and much of it he knew by heart in Latin and in German. The result of all this was a confidence which Job, for instance, did not instill. Coupled with this confidence was the determination to give his people a better version of the Psalter than the earlier ones had been.

The spirit in which he began his translation is shown in his preface to his second Psalm commentary, the "Operationes in Psalmo," dedicated to his friend and protector, the Elector Frederick the Wise of Saxony. The words written there might be placed as an introduction to the Psalm translation. With all his knowledge and after all his study, he still felt it highly presumptuous of him to attempt the elucidation of the Holy Writ, for "who will presume to say that he understands fully and in all its parts any one book of the Scriptures," or "who will presume to maintain that he understands fully and perfectly any single Psalm." Nevertheless he feels sure of himself and makes this reckoning with his authorities that what he says may not be the only true meaning, but it is truth.<sup>19</sup> He may see many things which Augustine or Jerome did not see.<sup>19</sup> The principle then is that all must mutually assist each other.<sup>19</sup> He is ready to assign to each his element of truth, and to use each in proportion to the truth which he believes it to contain. It is in this spirit that he begins his translation, and it remains for us to follow him in his labors and see the work grow into being.

<sup>19</sup> Werke, Weimar V. 23.

The first question that is naturally raised in connection with the Bible translation, either as a whole or in any of its parts, is the question as to the use of the original text, and of the various versions as bases for translation. It has become almost a tradition in this connection to say that the basis for Luther's New Testament translation was the edition of the Greek text made by Erasmus, and that Luther's Old Testament translation was from the original Hebrew text of an edition which appeared in Brescia in the year 1494.<sup>20</sup> Generally speaking, or for the information of the casual reader, this statement is correct. With regard to the Psalms however, a careful study of the manuscript leads us to a conclusion which is not diametrically opposed to the above statement, but which adds a few necessary qualifications and reservations. In preparing his press manuscript of the translation of the Psalter, Luther made use of the Hebrew Psalter, the Gallican Psalter of the Vulgate version, and the third version of Jerome, the "Psalterium juxta Hebraeos." It is exceedingly difficult to assign to any of these three the position of basis, subordinating thereby the others to the rank of auxiliary. Nor is it possible to say that any one of the three was consistently used as a check, or that the revision was undertaken at the hand of one or the other. The original draft and the revised manuscript as it went to press were moreover the result of a collating of the three versions before the translator. After a comparison of the three, the author accepted those readings which appeared to him the true ones regardless of the Psalter in which they happened to be found. Luther's resulting Psalter is not a translation of the Hebrew Psalter, nor is it a translation of the Hebrew Psalter corrected from the Vulgate, nor vice versa. It is a translation of what appeared to him to be the correct version as it resulted from a comparison of the text of the Hebrew with the versions of the Vulgate and the third translation of Jerome.<sup>21</sup>

It becomes apparent immediately that Luther's treatment of the Hebrew is not in accord with the principles which modern research

<sup>20</sup> Briggs—The Book of Psalms. *International Critical Commentary*, 1908. I. Introd. 24.

<sup>21</sup> The question as to the probable influence of earlier German versions is left for a future discussion. Such influence has been traced with success in other parts of the Bible (Florer—Luther's Use of the Pre-Lutheran Versions of the Bible. Ann Arbor, 1912.). In the Psalms no apparent dependence appears, which would warrant treating these versions among the primary sources.

would demand. We today make a distinction between text and version. For us the Hebrew is the original text, and such works as the Gallican Psalter and the Third Psalter of Jerome we consider versions. Luther certainly had this idea, but in his method this distinction is not consistently observed. The examples which we shall introduce later will serve to illustrate the point that Luther made no distinction in his treatment of text and version. The inevitable result is that the text came to have but little more authority than the versions. Hence, differences and deviations from this "text-version" were not necessarily errors, but retained their validity. It is as if an English translator of Homer would use the German translation of Voss and the Greek text as of almost equal value. Such was the fundamental error in Luther's procedure, but it was this which gave to his translation of the Psalms its peculiar character. It is a collation of the three Psalters in which the Hebrew original text is treated as if it were but another version, to be submitted to the same collation and comparison as the Vulgate and Jerome.

This treatment of the Hebrew no doubt had its source in Luther's fear that he was not well-grounded in this subject, although his translation bears ample evidence that his fears were largely imaginary. He had always insisted that a knowledge of Hebrew was necessary to a complete understanding of the Old Testament. He urged the study of Hebrew in the universities, and bent all his energies to secure for his own university a competent teacher of the subject. He himself strove to acquire a knowledge of the language. We find him at various times reading in the Hebrew Psalter. Such a Psalter, with Latin marginal notes in his own hand, has been preserved in Frankfort-am-Main. At the hand of Reuchlin he had gone back to the Hebrew in earlier translations, and Reuchlin's "Rudimenta" had been his text-book. His lectures and commentaries are full of notes on the Hebrew and conclusions drawn from a study of the Hebrew word. We do Luther an injustice when we belittle his knowledge of Hebrew, although his own remarks would lead us to do so. Most of the variations from the Hebrew in his translation are not due to ignorance; they appear as errors or liberties because we insist on making him a translator of the Hebrew. He was not this and never intended to be. In his program the Hebrew was only one of the several "versions."

As a version, it was considered by the translator to be an important one, in fact the most important one. This is attested by the part it plays in the evolution of the Psalm manuscript. Many Psalms are almost direct from the Hebrew with but little comparison with other versions (Psalms 13, 14, 19, 83, 85, 86). Other Psalms show that he followed the Hebrew only when apparent and almost irreconcilable divergences existed (Psalm 24). Isolated passages where the Hebrew differed from the other versions and where Luther followed the Hebrew are numerous (23.4, 27.9, 28.1, 28.9, 32.4, etc.). At times when extreme difficulty beset him, he cast loose and followed the Hebrew with no regard for comparison (45.15). Where real differences of great moment exist, such as the interpolation in Psalm 14 at verse three of the passage in Romans 3.12-18, he followed the Hebrew as supported by Jerome. This dependence on the Hebrew has misled students into believing that we have to deal here with a free translation from the Hebrew, or a translation mediated by the Vulgate. The first position is untenable because the seeming freedom can be explained by reference to the Vulgate or Jerome's third Psalter. The second position would not explain passages literally from the Vulgate or Jerome, where the Hebrew divergence is ignored. The logical position is one in which the three Psalters are treated as versions of varying value, but all to be submitted to the same method of procedure.

If Hebrew was not entirely and actively in the earlier works, Latin was there, and there on a firm basis of critical knowledge and ample practice. In his work on the Psalms, any attempt on his part to get away from the Latin Psalter would have been folly indeed. He knew the Psalms by heart in Latin, and that language was more fluent on his tongue than his native German. We must remember that the medium through which all these men had learned their Hebrew and Greek, was Latin, the language of the cloister and the university. The Hebrew Psalter in Frankfort with its marginal notes is of interest here. The notes are but a few Latin words in the margin. In Psalm 119 they are the beginning words, found in the Vulgate, of various sections of that long alphabetical Psalm.<sup>22</sup> It would seem that he read his Hebrew Psalter in Latin.

Before pointing out the influence of the Latin Vulgate on the Psalm translation, it is necessary to protest against a serious mis-

<sup>22</sup> Werke, Weimar IX. 45.

take, which, if accepted, would lead to the exclusion of the Vulgate from serious consideration in the Bible translation. Many authors have been led into a supposition that there was a feeling of hostility towards the Vulgate in Luther's mind. The reasoning is easily followed. The Vulgate was the book of the Roman Church, and as an enemy of the Pope and of the Church, he might also be an enemy of the book. This is not the case. The Vulgate was for Luther one of the versions of the word of God, and hence worthy of serious consideration and study. His criticism of the Roman Church was not that it made use of the Vulgate, but that it made no use of it. To be sure he had often pointed out places where the Vulgate might be improved upon, but there were other Vulgate translations which he had defended. When another version or interpretation seemed more logical, he turned to it; but when the Vulgate spoke truth to him, it was worthy of being accepted. Even after his own Bible had made its triumphant way through Germany, there was no open hostility towards the Vulgate, which it had in numerous cases superseded. As late as 1529 we find the Lord's Prayer in his Catechism still appearing in accord with the Vulgate, even after his Bible translation had made the necessary additions from the Hebrew. He wanted to give his people a better Psalter than the Vulgate, but it would have been entirely contradictory to the principles and program of Luther to work without the Vulgate as an aid in his Bible translation.

The Vulgate influence on the first draft is rather difficult to measure and determine exactly. Where Hebrew and Latin are in agreement and Luther's translation is in accord with them, the question of influence has to be laid aside. Where apparent differences occur, we can proceed with more assurance. Many of these differences have remained for more modern investigation to determine. Of many, however, Luther was aware. Since he treated the Hebrew as a version, he proceeded in such cases to determine which was the most logical, and many times his decision favored the Vulgate. In such cases we are able to point to an influence of the Vulgate. Of equal importance is the large number of passages in which his knowledge of Latin and the fact that it was the medium through which the Hebrew had been learned led to readings of the Hebrew which were influenced by the Latin. That this is an influence of the Vulgate is not to be denied. The familiarity of

Luther with the Latin very naturally led him to read the Latin version into the Hebrew.<sup>23</sup>

Many verses seem directly from the Vulgate, as, for instance, the opening verses of Psalm 20. The whole of Psalm 123 is very likely a direct rendition of the Vulgate text with but little regard for comparison, whereas Psalm 23 seems to have been subjected to a double translation from the Hebrew and the Vulgate. Almost countless are the occurrences, minor in nature, of similarity of voice, tense, or mood, where we are at liberty to trace an influence of the Vulgate. Of the two hundred and twenty odd passages that exhibit the influence of the Vulgate, the following will serve as examples. The relation is best shown by a quotation<sup>24</sup> of the key word in Luther's translation, the corresponding word in the Vulgate, and in a literal translation from the Hebrew.<sup>25</sup>

The Vulgate and Jerome's third version are of influence, particularly in the translation of those words and phrases which refer to the theological doctrines and beliefs of the time. This situation is to be explained by the fact that critical machinery was still lacking, by means of which Luther could have determined the differences in

<sup>23</sup> This same influence of the Vulgate was shown to exist for Job, in a paper by Florer and Lauer, read before the Modern Language Association at Chicago in 1908.

<sup>24</sup> For the sake of convenience and brevity the following abbreviations will be used in quoting: H.=Hebrew, V.=Vulgate, J.=“Psalterium juxta Hebraeos” of Jerome and L.=Luther's translation of 1524 in manuscript.

<sup>25</sup> A word should be said with respect to the renditions of the Hebrew which appear in the paper. Exception may be taken to some on the ground that these are not the only possible translations and in many cases not the ones which modern research accepts as correct. Everywhere the attempt was made to incorporate those renditions which would have been for Luther, literal translations. It is obvious that Luther's Hebrew must not be measured in the light of modern research. To discover these Luther renditions was of course impossible at times, but in most cases, hints in the “Dictata” and the “Operations” coupled with the historically critical work of Briggs (see below) and the testimony of modern translators (De Wette, Kautsch, Bindseil and Niemeyer) made possible at least an approach to accuracy.

Ps. 6.8 L. zorn	V. furore	H. grief
“ 9.21 “ lerer	“ legislatorem	“ fear
“ 15. 5 “ gellt	“ pecuniam	“ silver
“ 17. 8 “ augapffel im auge	“ pupillam oculi	“ daughter of the eye
“ 30.10 “ ynn das verwesen	“ in corruptionem	“ in the ditch
“ 31.22 “ festen stad	“ civitate munita	“ city of siege
“ 114. 1 “ wilden	“ barbaro	“ strangely speaking

belief between the writer of the Psalms and the people of the early sixteenth century. The Hebrew "goyim" is almost universally rendered "heyden," because of the Vulgate "gentes." In fact the Hebrew came to have that meaning for him. The great schism led to the translation "ketzer" in 119.113 for the Latin "iniquos" and the Hebrew "those of doubtful thoughts." That this translation is also contained in the word "heyden" is shown by a note in an earlier work, in which the Latin "gentes" is explained as "contra Ecclesiam."<sup>26</sup> In the same way the Hebrew "Sheol" becomes "helle" because of the Latin "inferno." Strange as it may seem, the name Messiah appears but once (84.10) in the Psalm translation; and here, combining the Vulgate "Christi" with the Hebrew "the anointed", Luther renders "gesalbeten Messia." Luther had departed from the extreme position of the first Psalm commentary, in which everything in the Psalms was referred to Christ. Here he gave them a more independent position, and studiously avoided reading into them any interpretation which might be turned so as to appear unduly prophetic. His faithfulness in this respect is best illustrated by a little correction in the title of Psalm 9. The first draft "von dem Son" is changed to "von der iugent des sons"—the change from capital to small letter being of particular significance.

The third version which served as a basis for the Psalm translation was the "Psalterium juxta Hebraeos" of Jerome. Whether or not Luther had a separate edition of this Psalter we do not know. We do know that he used the text appearing in the "Quintuplex Psalterium" of Lefèvre D'Étaples, because his copy of this work, with numerous notes in Luther's own hand, has come down to us. Just when Luther first became acquainted with this additional Psalter of Jerome is uncertain. We find numerous references to it in the "Dictata super Psalterium." Here in almost every instance in which variations occur, the Glossae bring the Jerome reading in a note, while the Scholae contain references not only to the text of Jerome, but also numerous citations from his commentaries. The translation of the Penitential Psalms was influenced by this Psalter as the introduction says, and in the second Psalm commentary, it is the "juxta Hebraeos" which is again used on every page. In the face of this constant use of Jerome's last version, extending over many years preceding the Psalm translation, it is surprising that

<sup>26</sup> Werke, Weimar III. 179.

the influence of Jerome's work on the translation of 1524 should have been overlooked and disregarded.

It goes without saying that Luther respected the labors of Jerome, for the activity of Jerome is very closely paralleled by the later work of Luther. Jerome began with a translation of the Greek Septuagint, which occupied much the same place for him that the Vulgate did for Luther. Jerome's next attempt drew in the Hextupla of Origen, very much as Luther later called on Reuchlin and Jerome. Finally Jerome went back to the original Hebrew, which he translated with all the aids he could muster. So with Luther in his final rendering. This last version of Jerome was of inestimable value to Luther. In his earlier labors it had been the mediator between the Hebrew and the Latin. In fact the references to Jerome in the "Dictata" are made simply as "Hebreo," and Luther often quotes this version as if it were the Hebrew original.<sup>27</sup> In case of disagreement between Vulgate and Hebrew, it was natural to turn to Jerome, and in case of difficulty with the Hebrew, the last version of Jerome came as a much-needed reference.

To determine the places where Jerome's "juxta Hebraeos" influenced the translation is difficult, since the close agreement of Jerome with the Hebrew lays the interpretation always open to the objection that it is the Hebrew and not Jerome which is being translated. There are however a number of passages in which the influence of Jerome can be readily discerned, both in the first draft and in the revised version. The following, quoted by the key word, will serve to illustrate:

Ps. 10.7	L. geytz	J. avaritia
" 16.4	" gotzen	" idola
" 2.2	" radschlahren	" tractabunt
" 19.2	" erzelen	" enarrant
" 29.4	" zierden	" decore
" 26.7	" predigt	" predicem
" 91.6	" seuche	" morsu
" 35.2	" spies	" hastam

In all these instances, the corresponding words of the Vulgate and of the Hebrew differ from the rendering in the last Psalter of Jerome.

The influence of Jerome is most noticeable in the translation of those passages which gave Luther difficulty, or in which striking differences between the Vulgate and the Hebrew met the translator.

<sup>27</sup> Werke, Weimar III. 469.

In such cases Jerome was called in. This is true in Psalm 35, in which the “juxta Hebraeos” appears as a mediator between the Vulgate and the Hebrew. Psalm 10 clearly shows the influence of Jerome, for Luther here, in the first five verses, follows the version of Jerome almost directly. This contention is borne out by the fact that in the “Operationes in Psalmos,” the complete rendition of Jerome is quoted in the commentary on the Psalm.<sup>28</sup> In one other respect is the influence of Jerome to be noted. This is in the translation of the titles. Perhaps nothing in the whole Psalter has given the commentator and translator more serious difficulty than these titles. Our modern criticism has, to all appearances, cleared up the matter by regarding most of them as marks designating earlier Psa... collections, and the remainder as musical directions, or assignments to liturgical use. We no longer see fit to attempt a reading in accordance with the content of the Psalm to which the title is prefixed. But it has taken centuries to decipher these mysterious words, and for Luther they were a matter of difficulty. In his earlier works, he spent much time and labor on the explanation of the titles, mainly because he attempted to bring the title into accord with the content of the Psalm—an attempt which often bordered on the impossible. An examination of the various titles points to extreme labor on the part of Luther and a leaning toward the authority of Jerome.

The common “ynn der hohe” from “oben zu singen” or “hoch zu singen” (V. “in finem,” J. “ad victoriam,” H. “of the Director”) is very much Luther’s own, in accord with his idea of the temple ceremony. In the same way, the Songs of Degrees become for him first “stullen lieder” or “auffsteygend lieder,” to be superseded by “lieder ym hoehern chor.” The labor which he expended on these titles is illustrated in the case of the difficult “Miktam.” In the “Dictata,”<sup>29</sup> at the first appearance of the word in the title of Psalm 16, he quotes Jerome, Paulus Burgensis, Lyra, Augustine, and Cassiodorus. Finally he sums up by saying that Lyra emphasizes “aureus psalmus,” Burgensis “de aurea materia”, and Jerome “ab aureo authore,” and hence he evolves “Eyn gulden Kleynod Davids.” The influence of Jerome is seen in the translation of the musical directions (Ps. 5. “fur die erbe” from Jerome’s “pro hereditatibus” and Ps. 46 “von der iugent” from Jerome’s “pro juven-

<sup>28</sup> Werke, Weimar V. 330.

<sup>29</sup> Werke, Weimar III. 102.

tutibus"). An annotation in Psalm 42 bears witness to the influence of Jerome. The "Maskil" of the title had given trouble before. Here Luther renders it "verstand klug lied" and adds the Latin "Eruditus Psalmus" in accord with Jerome's "Eruditio." These several citations point to an influence of Jerome—an influence which is all the more comprehensible when we find that the passages in which the Jerome influence is discernible are those which were explained by a reference to Jerome in the earlier exegetical labors.

The influence of these earlier works on the Psalm translation is not to be underestimated. The nature of the earlier work, the "Dictata super Psalterium," made it an excellent preparation for the Psalm translation. The Glossae brought an interlinear commentary; the notes brought parallel renditions from other versions, and the Scholae brought a compilation of the exegetical labors of earlier commentators. The Vulgate text was explained by the insertion of numerous synonyms and explanatory phrases. Derivations of words were explained, and things geographic and scientific were elucidated to the best of the writer's ability. The second commentary continued this method for the first twenty-two Psalms. It is not to be wondered at that these notes and commentaries come to light again in the Bible translation. One need not assume that the works were actually before Luther at the time of translation. The earlier work had fixed certain interpretations of familiar words and phrases, and it made but little difference which version was being used. A few striking examples will suffice.

Ps. 7.16. A gloss (Werke, Weimar III.-76) to the V. "foveam" brings "perditionem" which appears in 1524 as "verderben," afterwards revised to the literal "loch."

Ps. 23.2 V. "super aquam refectionis educavit me." A gloss (Werke, Weimar III.-139) to "educavit" brings "nutravit" and hence 1524 first draft "neeret mich am wasser guter ruge."

Ps. 41.3. A gloss (Werke, Weimar III.-229) to "animam" brings "voluntatem" which leads to "willen" in the first draft of 1524. The same situation prevails in Psalm 27.12.

Ps. 6.8 V. "turbatus est." In the Operationes we have "Reuchlin sic: verminavit" and hence the participle "vermottet" in 1524.

Ps. 22.30. The change from "Es beugen sich" to "Las Knye beugen" is foreshadowed by the gloss to "cadent": "genu flectent" in the Operationes (Werke, Weimar V.-667).

Ps. 17.14. The “leutten deyner hand” becomes clear when we find “todten” over the line and read in the Operationes (Werke, Weimar V.-485) that “leutten deyner hand” meant to Luther those dying touched by the hand of God, hence Jerome “qui mortui sunt in profundo.” The “todten” then does not become a free translation, but one prepared by earlier labors.

Ps. 25.14. A gloss (Werke, Weimar III.-144) to “hereditabit” is “possidebit” and hence “besitzen” in 1524.

From this discussion of the sources we can arrive at some conclusion as to the method employed. That the work was a collation of the versions is seen by the nature of the first draft. But one other point needs emphasis. A mere difference of authority did not necessarily constitute one correct, and the others wrong. Not even was the Hebrew favored in this regard. In his earlier work, Luther had been eager in all cases of disagreement to allow perfect justice to come to each authority. Witness the discussion in the Dictata on the word *Miktam*, in which seven authorities are quoted and each translation justified. So now in the Bible translation he strives to accept as much of each version as possible, and attempts to combine the various renderings. At times it seems as if he put the three texts together and then made his translation from the resultant of the three. In a larger number of cases it is the Hebrew and Vulgate which are combined.<sup>30</sup> The first draft, as a result of this method, presents a number of peculiarities worthy of note. The first is a number of unfinished passages. Very often a word gave the translator difficulty causing a blank to be left, or the insertion of a Hebrew or Latin word (44.10, 44.24, 43.2, 38.9, 118.12, 31.14, among others). In almost every case, the cause of the difficulty was a divergence of the Hebrew and the Vulgate. This also caused whole passages to be left blank (32.7 and 87.7 among others).

The second peculiarity is the fact that a large number of passages were left with parallel translations. As excellent examples, the following may be quoted:

Ps. 44.6 “wollen,” “mugen,” “kuenden,” and “werden” left as auxiliary to go with verb “stossen.”

Ps. 89.29 “sicher,” “trew”, and “fest” as adverb with verb “bleyben.”

<sup>30</sup> 29.1, 47.10, 2.12, 89.3, 6.7, 87.6, 88.19, 109.19, 112.6, 140.11, and numerous other instances are examples of such combination.

Ps. 119.1. Two idioms remaining: "die on wandel sind auff dem wege" and "die eyn wesen furen on taddel."

Ps. 39.8 "meyn harren ist auff dich." The word "ich" above the line points to a second possibility.

Ps. 42.10. Two parallel renditions: "weyl meyn feynd mich drenget" and "vmb des dranges willen engstet."

The large number of these constructions remaining double and their various nature may be traced to three causes:

1. The natural difficulties of translation and the keen desire of Luther to find the right word, together with his admitted ignorance of colloquial German, led him to postpone the final settlement of the correct translation until the time of the general revision.

2. Coupled with this was the fact that Luther, together with all his contemporary authors, loved to pile up synonyms. We find this in all his earlier work, and excellent examples can be found in both Latin and German writings. One of the early Latin sermons has the following German insert:

. . . . . "Sunt enim: vergiftete Schlangen, Verraether, Verloffer, Moerder, Diebe, Stroeter, Tyrannen, Teuffel und alles Unglueck, verzweiffelt, unglaubig Neidhardt und Hasser."<sup>31</sup>

In the "Dictata super Psalterium" we have in a note to the word "sigillatim" the following piling up:

. . . . . "singulatim, singillatim, singulanter, seorsum, solitari, propie, distributavi."<sup>32</sup>

This practice led to any number of insertions of synonyms left to be decided upon revision.

3. In addition to these two causes, however, there was a third, entirely in keeping with his method of translating. He found upon comparison of the versions that different shades of meaning were expressed. In the first flow of translation it would have interfered too much to have decided one way or the other at the time. Hence many passages were left double because of differences, more or less great, in the Hebrew and Vulgate. To illustrate:

Ps.	L. wollen: wolgefalen	V. voluit	H. delight.
" 18.20	" veralltet: faulet	" inveterati	" fade.
" 18.46	" wollten: fodderten	" voluntate	" request.
" 21. 3	" mechtig: grewlich	" superexaltium	" ruthless.
" 37.35	" willen: lust	" volue	" delight
" 40. 9			

<sup>31</sup> Werke, Weimar I. Sermone aus den Jahren 1514-1517. Sermon 4.

<sup>32</sup> Werke, Weimar III. 180.

Ps.	L. wecke: richte	V. resuscita	H. raise
" 44.14	" setzest: machst	" posuisti	" make.
" 44.25	" trubsal: drang	" tribulationis	" oppression.
" 90. 1	" zuflucht: wonung	" refugiam	" habitation.
" 91. 2	" zuflucht: burg	" refugiam	" fortress.
" 93. 2	" fertig: bereyt	" parata	" established.
" 119.25	" boden: staub	" pavimento	" dust
" 136. 6	" gefestiget: ausbreyttet	" firmavit	" spread out.
" 129. 4	" ioch: seyle	" cervices	" cord

These peculiarities of the first draft are the results of his method of procedure. A revision was in the mind of the author, while the first draft was in the process of completion. When this revision was undertaken, the same principles and method of translation still prevailed.

The revision had first of all to deal with the unfinished parts. Since these had been caused by a divergence of the sources or by excessive difficulty, they remained difficult spots. The result is that in most cases he departed from his method of comparison, and followed the Hebrew. At other places he made a last attempt at reconciling the versions. The passages remaining double then drew his attention. The various possibilities were examined in the light of the versions, and a decision reached in favor of one or the other. In some cases the form corresponding more nearly to the Latin was favored; in others, the form closer to the Hebrew; in some cases, both were discarded. There can be no more direct proof that the manuscript was not corrected to conform to any one of the three versions. In cases where it was merely a choice of synonym, the choice was naturally controlled by questions of accuracy, variety, shade of meaning, etc.

In addition to these changes in revision which the condition of the first draft made imperative, the author made a large number of others. This was in keeping with his whole aim in translating. He wanted to render the Scriptures into the best possible German, and was never satisfied with his work. He thought there was always room for improvement, even in places where there was no question of the accuracy of the first draft. Many of the corrections are to be attributed to this indefatigable labor and ardent zeal; others, however, are the result of continued comparison of the three versions before him. As a result of this comparison of the three sources, a large number of revisions were made, which brought the final rendition closer to one or the other of the three. There is no

consistency in this matter. In some cases it meant a change from the Hebrew to the Vulgate, again from the Vulgate to the Hebrew, with an occasional influence of Jerome's last version. This is an added proof that the revision was not undertaken at the hand of one version alone.

The revisions which brought the final rendition nearer to the Vulgate, number about sixty; and of these, the following will illustrate their nature.

Ps. 88.5 L. eyn krafftloser man>eyn man on hulffe. H. man without strength. V. homo sine adjutorio.  
“ 40.15 L. die lust haben an meynem vngluck>die myr vbels gonnen. H. those who delight in evil for me V. qui volunt mihi mala.  
“ 43.2 L. vmb des dranges willen des feyndes>wenn mich meyn feynd drenget. H. by the oppression of the enemy. V. dum affligit me inimicus.  
“ 89.45 L. lessest auffhoren>zustorest. H. made to cease. V. destruxisti.  
“ 47.5 L. er erwelet vns vnser erbteyl>er erwelet vns zum erbteyl. H. he will choose for us our inheritance. V. Elegit nobis hereditatem suam.

There are about an equal number of revisions, which bring the final from the Vulgate nearer to the Hebrew. Of these the following:

Ps. 2.3 L. last ioch>seyle. V. iugum. H. cords.  
“ 12.7 L. sibenfeltig>sibenmal. V. septuplum. H. seven times.  
“ 18.35 L. vnd spannet meyne arm wie eyn ehern bogen>vnd leret meynen arm den ehern bogen spannen. V. et posuisti, ut arcum aereum, mea brachia. H. teaching . . . . so that my arms press down a bow of brass.  
“ 36.9 L. truncken>voll werden. V. inebriabuntur. H. be sated.  
“ 139.17 L. Aber wie kostlich sind myr deyne freunde . . . . wie mechtig sind yhre heubter>aber wie kostlich sind fur myr gott deyne gedancken, wie gros ist yhre summa. V. Mihi autem nimis honorificati sunt amici tui, Deus; confortatus est principatus eorum. H. And how precious have been to

me thy thoughts, O God: how strong have been  
their sums.

The revisions, bringing the corrected manuscript closer to Jerome,  
are less numerous. There are about a dozen in all.

Ps. 16.9 L. ynn sicherheyt>sicher. V. in spe. H. in security.  
J. confidenter.

“ 17.4 L. weg des reyssers>weg des reubers. V. vias duras.  
H. of the violent. J. vias latronis.

“ 35.3 L. las erfur>zeuch erfur. V. effundi. H. draw out.  
J. evagina.

The same method of combining was carried on in the revision.  
The Vulgate and the Hebrew are most often combined.

Ps. 31.11 L. matt worden>verfallen. V. infirmata est. H. stum-  
bled.

“ 33.16 L. risse, gewalltiger>starcker man. V. gigas. H. mighty  
man.

“ 94.1 L. brich erfur>erscheyne. V. libere egit. H. shine forth.  
J. ostendere.

At times the translation of his own note in the first draft appears  
in the revised translation.

Ps. 29.1 L. Kinder der gotter>starcken. H. sons of Gods.  
V. filii Dei.

Note “filii fortium / forte.”

“ 109.3 “ “ ubique”>“allenthalben” in text.

And many times the final is a combination of his own suggested  
possibilities.

Ps. 25.3 “auff dich harret” and “deyn erwartet”>“deyn erhar-  
ret.”

There are of course many corrections made in the interests of  
unity and uniformity, as in Psalms 22, 118, and 119. Very often  
the aim at uniformity leads to corrections not always of the best as  
in 7.17. The corrections in many cases show a great elaborateness  
of method, and a constant searching for a correct rendition. For  
instance, Ps. 7.15:

vntugent vnd muhe hat er empfangen und wird falscheyt  
geberen>mit boses und vngluck ist er schwanger und wird  
nichts geberen— . . . . . er wird aber eynen feyl  
geberen.

Nevertheless, the numerous corrections in the revision are made in a  
most economical manner. Parts of words are cut and syllables

added, so that the final is often far from clear. For instance in 5.12 "frolich" is separated into its syllables by a mysterious "Dich" afterwards cut. But the first syllable of the word is not repeated. In a few instances, a regard for the printer led Luther to rewrite a half-verse, but this is a rare exception.

It remains to view the translated Psalter as a work of literary merit, and measure thereby the honor due its translator. Luther set out to give his people a Psalter better than the earlier versions, and he considered his method best-suited to produce such a Psalter. That such a method may have its shortcomings or weaknesses in the light of modern research methods is not to be denied. The excellence of the Psalter, however, as a work of literary merit, will go far to make up any defects in method and will render eternal tribute to Luther's genius as a translator.

The Psalms were poetry for Luther. He wanted them recited and sung in the new form of church worship. He encouraged others to arrange them as church songs, and his own paraphrases have given us some of the grandest Lutheran hymns. In his translation he sought, as best he could, to preserve the poetic qualities of the original. The form he retained religiously, even with the numerous corrections, and he was very careful that the half verse arrangement should be consistently carried out. In all his earlier work on the Psalms he had taken great pains to note any differences in verse arrangement and structure. The peculiar character of Hebrew poetry was of course unknown to him, and hence no attempt was made to take over into the German its essential qualities. But much attention was given to rhythm, balance, variety, and other qualities in their nature poetic. Luther was a real poet at times, and the occurrence of many poetical expressions (raunen, beben, brausen, etc.) attest his interest in the purely poetical side of his work.

In his earlier labors on the Psalms, Luther had often had occasion to complain of the vagueness of some of the passages. Many a time he openly confessed that a certain verse was unintelligible to him. Not all of these passages were cleared up by the time he set his hand to the translation of 1524, and not all were cleared up in the course of the work. With all his knowledge of the Psalms, there were some difficulties which of necessity remained insurmountable for him. A brief examination of these difficulties will show their nature and importance.

In the first place it is true that notwithstanding Luther's wide reading, real critical machinery for the study of the Psalms was lacking to him. Our present era is just beginning to make up this deficiency. For Luther, the real nature of the Psalms was a closed book. He had not the desire and not the means to view them in an historical light. For the exegete, this situation was of importance, while for the translator, the lack of critical works on the Psalms was especially trying. There was no question in Luther's mind that everything in the Psalms was authentic. He could not know that much was merely the work of scribe and copyist. To translate these later addenda as integral parts of the Psalms and attempt to weld all into an homogeneous whole was well-nigh impossible. The vagueness of passages in Psalms 7 and 8 is to be traced to this source. Another source of vagueness was the fact that the dialogue character of many of the Psalms, although apparent, was not sharply marked. The number of changes of person in Luther's manuscript attest to this difficulty, and Luther spent much time in his earlier commentary trying to throw some light on this question. In Psalms 2, 41, and 91, we find the conversational division lost, with resulting vagueness in the final rendition.

This lack of critical material was paralleled by a lack of knowledge of the "Realien," which is so necessary to the genesis of a translation. Luther and Melanchthon had planned an edition of a map of the Biblical lands, but had given up the undertaking. Their own knowledge of the geography was very meagre. Furthermore, authentic political history, except as it could be gleaned from the Scriptures themselves, was unknown to them, and the history of the neighboring peoples was even more a matter of ignorance. In this situation, it is to be supposed that their knowledge of the fauna and flora of the countries was only elemental, and led to many renditions mediated by the Latin. Material on the manners and customs of the Biblical peoples was of course more accessible. Much came from the Scriptures themselves, and in these Luther was well versed. How this knowledge comes to light is shown in a most interesting manner in Psalm 81.4. The Hebrew has:

"Blow ye the cornet in the new moon, at the full moon for  
the day of our festival."

The Vulgate:

"Buccinate in Neomenia tuba, in insigni die solennitatis  
vestrae."

Luther has:

"Ynn vnserm feste der lauberhutten."

The Dictata clears us up on this matter.<sup>33</sup> Here he says that "neumonden" refers to September, and then from Numbers 3.23 he names his festival accordingly. This is an excellent example of the influence of his earlier critical labors. Many passages seemingly free or unusual are to be explained by a reference to these works.

Luther, at a time later than his Bible translation, once expressed his views on translation, and, as is to be expected, emphasized the advantages of keeping to the sense, and slighting the word if necessary. As a result, one should expect to find in his Psalm translation numerous places where a literal rendition is avoided in favor of a free translation. Students of Luther have attached too much importance to Luther's own words in this matter, and have been led to ascribe to him a method of translation essentially free. Closer study of the manuscript and of the method shows us that many translations apparently free are but literal translations of the developed text, constructed by comparison and collation. Some free passages indeed are to be found, but in much smaller number than might be supposed. A survey of those points at which Luther translated freely, or, at which he introduced into the translation elements foreign to the sources, will serve to bring out those contributions in the Psalm-translation which are clearly the work of Luther, regardless of source or previous version.

The first contribution which Luther made may be summed up in his use of the modal auxiliaries. It will be agreed that this does not necessarily mean freedom, since the original must certainly have sought to express such shades of meaning as the German modals make possible. Luther, however, makes the most of the modals, and in the Psalms uses them to render a great variety of construction. They are used to translate simple future construction, to give the meaning of the Hebrew Hiphil, to render the Latin subjunctive, and very often to intensify the character of the action expressed. This last is especially true of "sollen" and "muessen," since the Psalms say much of obligation. A study of Luther's use of the modals in all their varying possibilities would show him at his best as a translator. The great flexibility of the modal construction he brought to bear on his originals, and gained thereby a great variety and wealth of expression.

<sup>33</sup> Werke, Weimar III. 611.

A second peculiarity of the Luther translation savors of freedom, although it does not really point to free translation in the ordinary sense of the word. Luther was preparing his translation for the everyday man of his time. His great aim was, then, to bring the language of his translation as close as possible to the tongue of the people for whom it was intended. Not only this, but the references to daily life had to be to the life of German peasant and workman of the sixteenth century, and not to the life of the Jew of the Monarchy or the Exile. The result of this plan and endeavor was, in the first place, the appearance of a number of colloquialisms in the text. A good example is the "wesscher" for "vir linguosus" or Hebrew "man of tongue" in Psalm 140.23, or "har zu berg" in 119.120, and many others. A second result is the use of proverbs, or the translation in maxim form of many of the passages. The puzzling "feyl geberen" of 7.15 may be one of these. The third result is the open and apparent anachronism when the life and belief of the people are touched. We have mentioned the source of such words as "helle," "heyden," and "ketzer." Another interesting example is the occurrence of the word "hertzogen" in Psalm 83.12.

The third peculiarity of the translation is more of the nature of real freedom. This lies in Luther's use of connectives. The parallelism of Hebrew poetry was unknown to him and his Latin predecessors. The result was that a literal rendition would have been a series of clauses, connected in thought to be sure, but isolated as to grammatical structure, or at most loosely connected in compound sentence form. That a connective was often understood goes without saying, and for the translator who knew nothing of the essential nature of the poetry before him, the expression of the connective became imperative. In Psalm 37.12-13:

The wicked deviseth against the righteous and  
gnasheth his teeth at him.  
The Lord laugheth at him; for he seeth that his  
day cometh.<sup>34</sup>

This antithetical parallelism must be connected by Luther to read: "Aber der herr lachet sein" . . . . ; a reading mediated by the Vulgate, "Dominus autem . . . . ." And Psalm 37.1-2:

<sup>34</sup> Briggs 1.323.

Fret not thyself because of evil-doers, and be not envious  
against them that do wrong.  
As grass they shall speedily wither, and like  
the fresh grass fade.<sup>35</sup>

The Hebrew here is an emblematic parallelism. For Luther a grammatical relation is expressed: "Denn wie das gras . . . . . , again mediated by the Vulgate "Quoniam tamquam foenium . . . . . "

In such cases as these, the introduction of the connective was mediated by the Latin and did no violence to the context. By analogy with this practice however, connectives were introduced in large number, and often grammatical relations of cause or purpose were thereby expressed, which have no basis in the originals. A very good example occurs in Psalm 4.5. The first draft had

"Tobet und sundiget nicht."

The Hebrew has

"Tremble ye and sin not."

The rendition of tremble as "tobet" is foreshadowed in the *Operationes*.<sup>36</sup> In the revision this translation is colored by the Vulgate, "Irascimini, et nolite peccare."

The result is a change from "tobet" to "zurnet." Then the two verbs are brought together in grammatical relation; the final inserts a connective; and we have

"Zurnet yhr so suendiget nicht."

Other places where such introductions occur are "drumb," (26.1 and 28.5) "dass," (81.10 and 119.17) "so," (109.28 and 138.3). Connectives are introduced in many other places, but in most of these they are to be found in the Vulgate, and have but little effect on the final rendition.

In addition to all these examples of quasi freedom, there are a number of places where Luther translates freely in every sense of the word. In many cases this freedom comes as the result of difficulty or because of a divergence of the versions. At such times he works to reconcile the versions, and, failing in this, goes ahead freely (Ps. 33.3, 35.15-16, 17.4, 45.9-10). The resulting free passages are almost universally good translations. In fact some of the most brilliant translations are in this category (Ps. 24.20, 36.2, 37.2,

<sup>35</sup> Briggs I.323.

<sup>36</sup> Werke, Weimar V.113.

39.7, 45.2-3, 84.11, 88.2, 89.48). It remains true, however, that the passages freely translated are comparatively few in number. Moreover it is easy to see that a free translation was not his aim and purpose. In Ps. 34.13, when he finds it necessary to translate freely, he recognizes the literal rendition in a footnote. Nor was an uncompered translation of either one of the versions his aim. In Ps. 118.5 and 80.16 he translates from the Vulgate, but recognizes the literal Hebrew in the margin. Many of his Latin notes are but paraphrases of the Vulgate, to be compared with the Hebrew at the time of revision.

Such is the Psalter as it came from the pen of the reformer, and made its first appearance in 1524. It came as a culmination of years of study and labor, and was itself the fruit of hard, concentrated, persevering activity. The manuscript has given us the material for studying this activity. A scrutiny of this manuscript has shown us (1) that Luther worked with the three texts before him; namely, the Massoretic Hebrew text in the edition of 1484, the Gallican Psalter of the Vulgate, and the Psalter as found in the "Psalterium juxta Hebraeos" of Jerome, (2) that these three Psalters were used not only during the completion of the first draft, but also at the time the revision was undertaken, (3) that these three texts were considered of almost equal value, whereas but one was text, and the others versions, (4) that the previous work on the Psalms had prepared a great deal of the translation, (5) that the method was a scientific one, consisting of comparison and collation. The Psalter, as it appeared in 1524, is the result of an earnest attempt on the part of the author to give his people the Psalms in a language which they could understand, and thereby lead them to make this Psalter a part of their daily religious worship, both public and private.

EDWARD HENRY LAUER.

*State University of Iowa.*